



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS  
2 NAVY ANNEX  
WASHINGTON DC 20370-5100

MEH:ddj  
Docket No: 8529-98  
8 September 1999

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to the provisions of title 10 of the United States Code, section 1552.

A three-member panel of the Board for Correction of Naval Records, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 8 September 1999. Your allegations of error and injustice were reviewed in accordance with administrative regulations and procedures applicable to the proceedings of this Board. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of your application, together with all material submitted in support thereof, your naval record and applicable statutes, regulations and policies. In addition, the Board considered the advisory opinion furnished by BUPERS memorandum 1000 PERS-312E/08 of 9 August 1999, a copy of which is attached.

After careful and conscientious consideration of the entire record, the Board found that the evidence submitted was insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice. In this connection, the Board substantially concurred with the comments contained in the advisory opinion. Although there is both a 48 month and a 36 month contract in your microfiche records the 48 month contract is correct; and in fact you were on continuous active duty from May 1986 until you reenlisted on 12 April 1990. This discrepancy in contracts had no bearing on the amount of Selective Reenlistment Bonus (SRB) you received. When you reenlisted on 12 April 1990 you had remaining obligated service to 26 May 1990, that amount was deducted from your SRB computations, which is standard procedure. Accordingly, your application has been denied. The names and votes of the members of the panel will be furnished upon request.

It is regretted that the circumstances of your case are such that favorable action cannot be taken. You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon submission of new and material evidence or other matter not previously considered by the Board.

Docket No. 8529-98

In this regard, it is important to keep in mind that a presumption of regularity attaches to all official records. Consequently, when applying for a correction of an official naval record, the burden is on the applicant to demonstrate the existence of probable material error or injustice.

Sincerely,

W. DEAN PFEIFFER  
Executive Director

Enclosure



**DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY**

**NAVY PERSONNEL COMMAND**

**5720 INTEGRITY DRIVE**

**MILLINGTON TN 38055-0000**

1000

PERS-312E/08

9 AUG 1999

From: Commander, Navy Personnel Command  
To: Executive Director, Board for Correction of naval Records  
Via: Assistant, Board for Correction of Naval Records (PERS-00Z)

[REDACTED]

Ref: (a) BCNR ltr of 10 Jun 99

1. We have reviewed reference (a). According to the member's service record, his enlistment contract (DD Form 4) dated 28 May 1986 was under the TEP Enlistment Program with an active duty obligation of 48 months. His Record of Military Processing – Armed Forces of the United States (DD Form 1966/1) of 28 May 1986, Section V, shows enlisting for the Fireman Apprenticeship Training Program with an active duty obligation of 36 months.
2. There appears to be a conflict between the two documents as to the number of months of obligated service. However, member has had continuous service since 28 May 1986. It is our opinion that the member does not have a discrepancy in his separation/discharge dates.

*J. Stollings*  
J. STOLLINGS  
By direction